



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,323	07/11/2000	Prasad V. Upadrasta	INTL-0398-US(P8981)	1008

8791 7590 08/11/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

MA, JOHNNY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/613,323

Applicant(s)

UPADRASTA, PRASAD V.

Examiner

Johnny Ma

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

It is noted that Applicant does not traverse the well-known in the art statement that it is well known to parsing/separately store indexing information for the purpose of providing a comprehensive index such as EPG program information received with broadcasted programming for the purpose of facilitating the selection of content and alleviate the receiver processor load of creating an index, thus the well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/18/2005, regarding claims 16-30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues “[i]ndependent claims 16, 22 and 28 have been amended to include a similar feature of sending a request over a back channel, where the medium (that is used to receive content related to the request) and back channel are not the same...Dillon does not appear to teach or suggest this feature.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. Dillon discloses receiver functions including “[p]roviding the multicast network 24 (or optionally the back-end subsystem 22) with subscription or unsubscription requests” (Dillon [0078]), teaching “sending a request over a back channel.” Furthermore, the Dillon reference discloses a medium that is used to receive content related to the request wherein “the WebCast system 20 of the present invention consists of a back-end subsystem 22 which communicates with one or more multicast networks 24...The back-end subsystem 22 is connected to a plurality of web sites 18...The multicast network 24 multicasts information retrieved from the web sites 18 to a plurality of receivers 26 over a high-speed link (F)” (Dillon [0054]) wherein content is

Art Unit: 2617

transmitted via packages comprising “(1) a set of URL data item; (2) indexing information, such as a hash table, to allow quick access to the URL data item; and (3) various supplemental information identifying the set of URL data item contained by the package and other information to guide the use of its content” (Dillon [0101]) and the content is related to the request according to subscriptions based on subscribe and unsubscribe requests. The Dillon reference also discloses the medium and back channel are not the same wherein content is multicasted via the high-speed link F (Dillon [0063-0070]) and subscription requests are provided via back-end subsystem 22, low-speed link D (Dillon [0054,0072-0081])

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (US 2001/0003828 A1) in further view of Macrae et al. (US 2003/0005463 A1).

As to claim 1, note the Peterson et al. reference that discloses a client-side system for scheduling delivery of web content and locally managing the web content. The claimed “receiving a request over a back channel” is met by “[t]he client 184 establishes an account or some form of registration with the server 182. The client 184 then submits the user’s preferences to the server 182, which creates one or more filters 186 based on the user’s preferences. These filters 186 are maintained at the server 182 under the client’s account” (Peterson [0123]). The claimed “receiving content related to said request” is met by “[t]he webcast center 152 collects

Art Unit: 2617

Web pages from the Internet's World Wide Web 160 and stores them in a page cache 162"

(Peterson [0112]) in view of user preferences residing on server as discussed above. The claimed "generating an index table for said content" is met by the filtering of index and/or content at the server (Peterson [0124]). The claimed "multicasting said content and said index table over a medium to a plurality of receivers" is met by "client-server system 20 having multiple Web servers 22(1)-22(M) coupled to serve Web content to multiple clients 24(1)-24(N) via a distribution system 25" wherein distribution system comprises multicast transmissions (Peterson [0042]) and the server transmits the index and web content to clients (Peterson [0044-0045]). Note, the Peterson et al. reference discloses "[d]istribution system 26 represents many different types of distribution systems...such network systems (excepting perhaps multicast) are typically characterized as bi-directional...The distribution system 26 might also represent a broadcast transmission system in which Web content is distributed over a broadcast medium...generally characterized as a unidirectional system" (Peterson [0042-0043]). Also note, the Peterson et al. reference discloses "[a]nother implementation of the client is a Web-enabled television..." (Peterson [0117]). However, the Peterson et al. reference does not specifically disclose "wherein said medium and said back channel are not the same." Now note the Macrae et al. reference that discloses access to internet data through a television system. The claimed "wherein said medium and said back channel are not the same" is met by "a source of television signals 10 such as a terrestrial antenna, or a cable is connected to a television tuner 11" (Macrae [0021]) and "an Internet service provider (ISP) 33 is connected to microprocessor 24 by a transmission link 34 such as a telephone network..." (Macrae [0023]). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the Peterson et al. client server system with the Macrae et al. separate transmission medium and backchannel medium for the purpose of providing server-side filtering services to users on legacy networks that do not support bi-directional communications.

As to claim 2, the claimed “wherein multicasting said content includes pushing said content to said plurality of receivers” is met by the use of push-based architecture (Peterson [0046]) wherein “[i]n a push-based architecture, the server initiates data transfer to the client software. Multicast protocols, wireless pages, radio, and TV are examples of ‘pus-based’ architecture” (Peterson [0048]).

As to claim 3, the claimed “including determining whether a scheduled multicast time has arrived and if so multicasting said content and said index table over said medium to said plurality of receivers” is met by the use of a schedule to indicate the times and the frequency or address at which the Web content will be available” (Peterson [0094]) wherein it is inherent that the broadcast of Peterson content and index follow a transmission schedule in order for the schedule to accurately reflect the receipt of data.

As to claim 4, the claimed “including receiving said request from one of said receivers for content in a particular category” is met by “[t]he index UI 130 presents general categories, such as ‘News and Technology’, ‘Sports’, ‘Business’... The user can elect certain channels and content by appropriately marking them in the index viewer UI 122” (Peterson [0083]) wherein “[d]epending on the user’s selection, the client obtains the Web content either from the local cache, if available, or directly from the Web sites... themselves [web servers receive request for content and transmit]. Notice that the server supplying the filtered index need not be the actual

Art Unit: 2617

Web sites that hold the information, although it can be” (Peterson [0125]) wherein filtering may be performed on the server-side (Peterson [0121-0126])..

As to claim 5, please see rejections of claims 1 and 4.

As to claims 6-10, please see rejections of claims 1-5 respectively.

As to claim 11, note the Peterson et al. reference discloses a client-side system for scheduling delivery of web content and locally managing the web content. The claimed “a server” is met by “Web servers provide both the Web content 28 and an index 30 to the Web content” (Peterson [0044]). The claimed “a storage coupled to said server storing instructions that enable said server to receive a request over a back channel” is met by “[t]he client 184 establishes an account or some form of registration with the server 182. The client 184 then submits the user’s preferences to the server 182, which creates one or more filters 186 based on the user’s preferences. These filters 186 are maintained at the server 182 under the client’s account” (Peterson [0123]) wherein it is inherent that the server store instructions in storage in order for proper operation. The claimed “receive content related to said request” is met by “[t]he webcast center 152 collects Web pages from the Internet’s World Wide Web 160 and stores them in a page cache 162” (Peterson [0112]) and “the webcast center 152 retrieves the pages from the page cache 162, bundles them into composite package files, and stores them in a package store 164 (Peterson [0113]) in view of user preferences residing on server as discussed above, wherein it is inherent that server include instructions for enabling it to perform the webcast tasks. The claimed “generate an index table for said content” is met by the filtering of index and/or content at the server (Peterson [0124]). The claimed “and multicast said content and said index table over a medium to a plurality of receivers” is met by “client-server system 20

Art Unit: 2617

having multiple Web servers 22(1)-22(M) coupled to serve Web content to multiple clients 24(1)-24(N) via a distribution system 25” wherein distribution system comprises multicast transmissions (Peterson [0042]) and the server transmits the index and web content to clients (Peterson [0044-0045]). Note, the Peterson et al. reference discloses “[d]istribution system 26 represents many different types of distribution systems...such network systems (excepting perhaps multicast) are typically characterized as bi-directional...The distribution system 26 might also represent a broadcast transmission system in which Web content is distributed over a broadcast medium...generally characterized as a unidirectional system” (Peterson [0042-0043]). Also note, the Peterson et al. reference discloses “[a]nother implementation of the client is a Web-enabled television...” (Peterson [0117]). However, the Peterson et al. reference does not specifically disclose “wherein said medium and said back channel are not the same.” Now note the Macrae et al. reference that discloses access to internet data through a television system. The claimed “wherein said medium and said back channel are not the same” is met by “a source of television signals 10 such as a terrestrial antenna, or a cable is connected to a television tuner 11” (Macrae [0021]) and “an Internet service provider (ISP) 33 is connected to microprocessor 24 by a transmission link 34 such as a telephone network...” (Macrae [0023]). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Peterson et al. client server system with the Macrae et al. separate transmission medium and backchannel medium for the purpose of providing server-side filtering services to users on legacy networks that do not support bi-directional communications.

As to claim 12, the claimed “wherein said storage further stores instructions that enable the server to push said content to the plurality of servers” is met by the use of push-based

Art Unit: 2617

architecture (Peterson [0046]) wherein “[i]n a push-based architecture, the server initiates data transfer to the client software. Multicast protocols, wireless pages, radio, and TV are examples of ‘pus-based’ architecture” (Peterson [0048]).

As to claim 13, the claimed “wherein said storage further stores instructions that enable the server to determine when a scheduled multicast time arrives and when said scheduled multicast time arrives multicasts said content and said index table over said medium to the plurality of receivers” is met by the use of a schedule to indicate the times and the frequency or address at which the Web content will be available” (Peterson [0094]) wherein it is inherent that the broadcast of Peterson content and index follow a transmission schedule in order for the schedule to accurately reflect the receipt of data.

As to claim 14, the claimed “wherein said storage further stores instructions that enable the server to receive said request from one of said receivers for content in a particular category” is met by “[t]he index UI 130 presents general categories, such as ‘News and Technology’, ‘Sports’, ‘Business’... The user can elect certain channels and content by appropriately marking them in the index viewer UI 122” (Peterson [0083]) wherein “[d]epending on the user’s selection, the client obtains the Web content either from the local cache, if available, or directly from the Web sites... themselves [web servers receive request for content and transmit]. Notice that the server supplying the filtered index need not be the actual Web sites that hold the information, although it can be” (Peterson [0125]).

As to claim 15, please see rejections of claims 11 and 14.

5. Claims 16-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillon (US 2003/0206554 A1).

As to claim 16, note the Dillon reference that discloses a system and method for multicasting multimedia content. The claimed “sending a request over a back channel” is met by receiver functions including “[p]roviding the multicast network 24 (or optionally the back-end subsystem 22) with subscription or unsubscription requests” (Dillon [0078]). The claimed “receiving content together with an index table related to said request from a server” is met by “the WebCast system 20 of the present invention consists of a back-end subsystem 22 which communicates with one or more multicast networks 24... The back-end subsystem 22 is connected to a plurality of web sites 18... The multicast network 24 multicasts information retrieved from the web sites 18 to a plurality of receivers 26 over a high-speed link (F)” (Dillon [0054]) wherein content is transmitted via packages comprising “(1) a set of URL data item; (2) indexing information, such as a hash table, to allow quick access to the URL data item; and (3) various supplemental information identifying the set of URL data item contained by the package and other information to guide the use of its content” (Dillon [0101]). The claimed “over a medium, wherein said medium and said back channel are not the same” is met by multicasting via the high-speed link F (Dillon [0063-0070]) and providing subscription requests via back-end subsystem 22, low-speed link D (Dillon [0054,0072-0081]). The claimed “storing said index table and said content” is met by “[i]f the package receiver 56 determines that a package should be received, the package receiver 56 requests the multicast receiver 54 to enable the associated address(es). The package receiver 56 then processes the package’s packets, discarding packets already received and storing previously unreceived packets in memory (i.e., writing them to disk), thus reassembling the package” (Dillon [146]) wherein the package includes indexing information. Note the Dillon reference discloses a content viewer (Dillon [0167-0169]) and the

Art Unit: 2617

transmission of indexing information with URL data items (Dillon [0101]) wherein the indexing information minimizes the processing that the receiver must perform on the content prior to displaying it to the user (Dillon [0111]). However, the Dillon reference is silent as to “parsing said index table from said content.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to parsing/separately store indexing information for the purpose of providing a comprehensive index such as EPG program information received with broadcasted programming for the purpose of facilitating the selection of content and alleviate the receiver processor load of creating an index. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dillon indexing information accordingly for the above stated advantages.

As to claim 17, the claimed “including receiving at least two multicast transmissions, each transmission including content and an index table, and automatically accumulating said index tables from each of said multicast transmissions” is met by “[t]he package receiver 56 in each receiver 26 may optionally be configured to monitor receiver activity and/or user input to classify the receiver’s readiness to receive packages... The user may also enter preferences [flags] of when packages should be received” (Dillon [0139-0140]) wherein “[a] channel’s content, however, may be frequently updated by the web site operator and the updates may occur on an unknown basis and it is important to provide a WebCast user with an updated and consistent representation of a web site’s content” (Dillon [0093]) changes to web content are multicasted to the user (Dillon [0093, 0113]). Note that the multicasted packages comprise indexing information (Dillon [0101]) wherein delta packages (update packages) would result in the accumulation of indexing information from the multicast transmissions.

As to claim 18, please see rejection of claim 17 wherein the user may provide preferences for package downloads resulting in the determination of whether additional indexing information is accumulated.

As to claim 19, the claimed “further including conducting a search for a keyword in said index table” is met by “once the content viewer 58 has initialized, it receives requests for URLs from the browser 12 and attempts to find them from its “cache” of URLs” (Dillon [0166-0175]) wherein “organizing each package 34 as a single file with built-in indexing for quick access minimizes the processing that the receiver 16 must perform on the content prior to displaying it to the user” (Dillon [0111]).

As to claim 20, the claimed “determining whether the keyword is located in said index table and if not, indicating that the keyword was not found” is met by “once the content viewer 58 has initialized, it receives requests for URLs from the browser 12 and attempts to find them from its “cache” of URLs” (Dillon [0166-0175]) wherein “organizing each package 34 as a single file with built-in indexing for quick access minimizes the processing that the receiver 16 must perform on the content prior to displaying it to the user” (Dillon [0111]) wherein “[t]he receiver may further determine when a URL data item requested to be accessed by the user is not present within the stored URL data items, notify the user that the requested URL data item is not stored, and allow the user to access the non-stored URL data item via a connection (such as dial-up modem) to a TCP/IP network, such as the Internet” (Dillon [0030]) .

As to claim 21, the claimed “including indicating that a search may be conducted over said back channel when the keyword was not found in said index table” is met by that discussed

in the rejection of claim 20 wherein URL data not found in the index table is acquired from the Internet.

As to claims 22-27, please see rejections of claims 16-21 respectively.

As to claim 28, note the Dillon reference discloses a system and method for multicasting multimedia content. The claimed “a processor” is met by “[e]ach receiver 26 may be, for example, a personal computer in user’s home or business. However, the receivers 26 may also comprise set top boxes, digital televisions or other devices capable of receiving Internet content” (Dillon [0054]) wherein it is inherent that that the receiver comprise a processor for performing the Dillon disclosed receiver functions (Dillon [0072]). The claimed “a storage coupled to said processor” is met by memory 28 as illustrated in Fig. 2 wherein it is inherent that a processor be coupled to the components of the receiver in order to control operation of such a receiver. The claimed “said storage storing instructions that enable said processor to send a request over a back channel” is met by receiver functions including “[p]roviding the multicast network 24 (or optionally the back-end subsystem 22) with subscription or unsubscription requests” (Dillon [0078]) wherein it is inherent that an operating system be stored in order for processor to perform receiver functions. The claimed “receive content together with an index table related to said request from a server” is met by “the WebCast system 20 of the present invention consists of a back-end subsystem 22 which communicates with one or more multicast networks 24...The back-end subsystem 22 is connected to a plurality of web sites 18...The multicast network 24 multicasts information retrieved from the web sites 18 to a plurality of receivers 26 over a high-speed link (F)” (Dillon [0054]) wherein content is transmitted via packages comprising “(1) a set of URL data item; (2) indexing information, such as a hash table, to allow quick access to the

Art Unit: 2617

URL data item; and (3) various supplemental information identifying the set of URL data item contained by the package and other information to guide the use of its content” (Dillon [0101]) wherein it is inherent that an operating system be stored in order for processor to perform receiver functions. The claimed “over a medium, wherein said medium and said back channel are not the same” is met by multicasting via the high-speed link F (Dillon [0063-0070]) and providing subscription requests via back-end subsystem 22, low-speed link D (Dillon [0054,0072-0081]). The claimed “and store said index table and said content” is met by “[i]f the package receiver 56 determines that a package should be received, the package receiver 56 requests the multicast receiver 54 to enable the associated address(es). The package receiver 56 then processes the package’s packets, discarding packets already received and storing previously unreceived packets in memory (i.e., writing them to disk), thus reassembling the package” (Dillon [146]) wherein the package includes indexing information. Note the Dillon reference discloses a content viewer (Dillon [0167-0169]) and the transmission of indexing information with URL data items (Dillon [0101]) wherein the indexing information minimizes the processing that the receiver must perform on the content prior to displaying it to the user (Dillon [0111]). However, the Dillon reference is silent as to “parsing said index table from said content.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to parsing/separately store indexing information for the purpose of providing a comprehensive index such as EPG program information received with broadcasted programming for the purpose of facilitating the selection of content and alleviate the receiver processor load of creating an index. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dillon indexing information accordingly for the above stated advantages.

As to claim 29, the claimed “wherein said storage stores instructions that enable the processor-based system to receive at least two multicast transmissions, each transmission including content and an index table, and automatically accumulate said index tables from said multicast transmissions” is met by “[t]he package receiver 56 in each receiver 26 may optionally be configured to monitor receiver activity and/or user input to classify the receiver’s readiness to receive packages... The user may also enter preferences [flags] of when packages should be received” (Dillon [0139-0140]) wherein “[a] channel’s content, however, may be frequently updated by the web site operator and the updates may occur on an unknown basis and it is important to provide a WebCast user with an updated and consistent representation of a web site’s content” (Dillon [0093]) changes to web content are multicasted to the user (Dillon [0093, 0113]). Note that the multicasted packages comprise indexing information (Dillon [0101]) wherein delta packages (update packages) would result in the accumulation of indexing information from the multicast transmissions.

As to claim 30, the claimed “wherein said storage further stores instructions to enable to system to conduct a search for a keyword in said index table” is met by “once the content viewer 58 has initialized, it receives requests for URLs from the browser 12 and attempts to find them from its “cache” of URLs” (Dillon [0166-0175]) wherein “organizing each package 34 as a single file with built-in indexing for quick access minimizes the processing that the receiver 16 must perform on the content prior to displaying it to the user” (Dillon [0111]).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnny Ma whose telephone number is (571) 272-7351. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jm


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600